UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

JENNY Y. CHOW AND PETER S. CHOW,
Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:19-CV-607-RSL

ORDER DISMISSING CASE

This matter comes before the Court on the Court's "Order Requiring More Definite Statement." Dkt. #11. Plaintiffs filed an Amended Complaint on July 30, 2019. Dkt. #12.

Plaintiffs were granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on May 23, 2019. Dkt. #8. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court may dismiss an *in forma pauperis* action if the complaint is frivolous or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. A case is frivolous if it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). It fails to state a claim on which relief can be granted if it does not "contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." Lewis v. City of Auburn, No. C17-1916-JLR-JPD, 2018 WL 2091416, at *1 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 9, 2018), report and recommendation adopted, No. C17-1916-JLR, 2018 WL 2089360 (W.D. Wash. May 4, 2018) (citing Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 664 (2009)).

The Amended Complaint does not cure the defects identified in the Court's previous order. Dkt. #11. Indeed, it is essentially a repetition of plaintiff's original complaint. Dkt. #1-2.

ORDER DISMISSING CASE - 1

The Court concludes that plaintiff's complaint is frivolous and fails to state a valid claim for relief. 28 USC § 1915(e)(2)(B). The Court hereby DISMISSES plaintiff's complaint WITH PREJUDICE. See <u>Lucas v. Dep't of Corr.</u>, 66 F.3d 245, 248 (9th Cir. 1995). DATED this 4th day of September, 2019. MMS (asuik Robert S. Lasnik United States District Judge